

### **REMARKS**

This is in response to the Notice of Non-Responsive Reply mailed 9/17/07, and in view of the Final Office Action mailed 3/20/2007, and further in view of the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed 6/21/2007.

Applicants have made note of the Examiner's request to amend the instant claims instead of adding new claims. With respect to any future amendments, Applicants wish to note that they will make every effort to satisfy this request by amending the instant claims instead of adding new claims.

Applicants have cancelled previously pending claims 1-31. Claims 32-62 have been newly added with respect to the RCE filed 6/21/2007. Applicants wish to emphasize that they are not conceding in this response that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

This response should obviate outstanding issues and make the pending claims allowable. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of this response.

### **STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Applicants have cancelled previously pending claims 1-31.

Claims 32-62 were newly added in the RCE filed 6/21/2007. The Examiner is requested to use the current copy of the claims presented in the current amendment as the clean copy of the claims.

### **OVERVIEW OF CLAIMED INVENTION**

The present invention provides a system and method for implementing support for the XA 2-phase commit protocols in client middleware for a cluster of one or more database servers that use shared disk technology. The present invention's method, as implemented in middleware, comprises the steps of: (a) aiding in receiving an invocation from a client for a first phase of commit for a transaction representing a unit of work; (b) inserting an entry in a relational table corresponding to the unit of work and transmitting an instruction to the server to prepare to commit for the transaction, wherein the inserted entry indicating the unit of work is potentially an indoubt entry; (c) receiving a request from the client, and if the received request is a commit or rollback decision: communicating with a server and processing the commit or rollback request, and upon successful processing, deleting an entry corresponding to the commit or rollback request in the relational table, else if the received request is a recover decision: querying the relational table to identify a list of indoubt units of work; transmitting the list of indoubt units of work to the client; receiving a commit or rollback decision from the client; communicating with the server to process the commit or rollback request, and upon successful processing, and deleting a corresponding entry in the relational table.

The present invention provides support for the XA 2-phase commit protocols without requiring the target database system to understand the XA 2-phase commit protocol. This is

accomplished by mapping the XA 2-phase commit protocols onto other 2-phase commit protocols that the database server does support (such as the non-XA 2-phase commit protocols that are defined in DRDA). Furthermore, the system and method allow the client system to fully support the XA RECOVER command in the instance that one or more members in the database server cluster are unavailable.

The present invention eliminates the need to scan logs of all the database members to produce a list of indoubt units of work for the XA RECOVER command and also eliminates the need for client-side logging in the database middleware when the DB2 server does not support XA protocols natively. Based upon the teachings of the present invention, the XA transaction manager and database middleware are able to issue the XA RECOVER command from any computer in the network (with no dependency on issuing RECOVER from the same computer in the network or the same IP address in the network).

### **35 U.S.C. §112 REJECTION**

The Examiner, in the Final Office Action of 03/20/2007, indicates that previously pending claims 10, 20, and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C §112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Newly added claims 41, 51, and 53 (which mirror language in previously presented claims 10, 20, and 22) have corrected this error by introducing language pointed out by the Examiner in the Final Office Action of 03/20/2007. Specifically, new claims 41, 51, and 53 recite the feature of a “separate network connection” instead of the previously recited feature of “separate networks”.

Based on this clarification, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to avoid issuing a 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection with respect to newly claims 41, 51, and 53.

Further, with respect to previously pending claims 2, 3, 13, 14, 19, and 21, “uncertainties” pointed out by the Examiner in the Final Office Action of 03/20/2007, have been corrected in the newly presented claims 33, 34, 44, 45, 50, and 52. Specifically, these claims have been amended to clarify that the entry corresponds to the COMMIT or ROLLBACK request.

Also, newly added claim 47 which recited language from previously pending claims 16 recites clarifying language that the relational table is a SQL table. The unclear language regarding inserting an entry in said relational table via a SQL INSERT instruction is removed to avoid any ambiguity.

Further, newly added claims 50 and 52 clarify previously presented claims 19 and 21 by removing the conditional language pointed to by the Examiner in the Office Action of 03/20/2007.

Based on such clarifications, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to avoid issuing a 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection with respect to newly added claims 33, 34, 44, 45, 47, 50, and 52.

### **35 U.S.C. §101 REJECTION**

Minor clarifications have been made to independent claims 32, 49 and 57 to recite computer-based methods that are implemented in computer readable program code stored in computer memory, which is a tangible medium.

Further, the Examiner is once again reminded that claims 43-48 have already been written as an article of manufacture claim, which are fully compliant under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Based on such clarifications, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to avoid issuing a 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection with respect to newly added claims 32-62.

### **COMMENTS REGARDING BENSON (6.873.995)**

Benson et al., also assigned to IBM, teaches a method of managing a content management system, said content management system being configured and controlled to begin a transaction and create an item at a client, establish a connection between the client and a

library server, generate a transaction identifier and insert a record for the transaction in a tracking table associated with the library server, pass transaction data from the client to a resource manager, process the transaction at the resource manager and record transaction data in a tracking table associated with the resource manager, return transaction success/failure data to the client, compare activity recorded in the tracking tables, and take corrective action based upon the activity comparison.

Benson fails to teach claim 32's feature of "inserting an entry in said relational table corresponding to said unit of work and transmitting an instruction to said server to prepare to commit for said transaction, said inserted entry indicating said unit of work is potentially an indoubt entry". In fact, Benson teaches away from the invention by using two tables. For example, see column 12-29 of Benson, which is reproduced below:

"The Library Server Tracking Table (LS TT) is created by the SQL command set shown in FIG. 2, and includes two tables organized as a 2-level hierarchy.

1. TxTbl: [TXID (PK), Status ("I" or "C"), CommitTimestamp]--A row with Status="I" is inserted by each (lazy) begin transaction, BEGTRAN. An end transaction, ENDTRAN(commit) changes "I" to "C", sets CommitTimestamp, and commits the relational database transaction on LS. An end transaction, ENDTRAN(rollack) rolls back the relational

database transaction, including the record inserted by begin transaction, BEGTRAN.

2. TxRMTbl: [TxID (non-null FK to TxTbl), Rmid]—A row is inserted by end transaction, ENDTRAN(commit) for each RM updated by the respective transaction.” (emphasis added).

It should be noted that the Benson reference teaches two tables to keep track of transactions, however, the Examiner’s citation, and the entire Benson reference is silent about indoubt entries. The Examiner is reminded that pending claims 32 and 43, for instance, specifically recite “a relational table storing indoubt entries” “inserting an entry in said relational table corresponding to said unit of work and transmitting an instruction to said server to prepare to commit for said transaction, said inserted entry indicating said unit of work is potentially an indoubt entry”.

Further, independent claim 49 teaches a software facilitating communication between a database cluster and a transaction manager, wherein the software “creates an SQL table for storing a list of potential indoubt units of work” and updates the SQL table of indoubt entries after execution of a COMMIT, ROLLBACK, or a RECOVER. Benson in its entirety lacks a teaching or suggestion for such features.

Also, independent claim 57 teaches a first software module invoked to create a relational table in said server to store potential indoubt units of work. Claim 26 also teaches for a second module invoked to insert or delete indoubt entries of work in said relational

table, wherein insertions of indoubt entries are performed if an invocation is received from said client for a first phase of commit for a transaction representing a unit of work; and wherein deletions of indoubt entries are performed upon successful processing of a commit or rollback decision. Benson in its entirety lacks a teaching or suggestion for such features.



**SUMMARY**

As has been detailed above, none of the references, cited or applied, provide for the specific claimed details of Applicants' presently claimed invention, nor renders them obvious. It is believed that this case is in condition for allowance and reconsideration thereof and early issuance is respectfully requested.

This response is being timely filed with a two-month extension of time fee. If additional deficiencies are found, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such deficiencies in the fees provided to Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

If it is felt that an interview would expedite prosecution of this application, please do not hesitate to contact Applicants' representative at the below number.

Respectfully submitted,

*/ramraj soundararajan/*

Ramraj Soundararajan  
Registration No. 53,832

IP AUTHORITY, LLC.  
4821A Eisenhower Ave  
Alexandria, VA 22304  
(703) 461-7060

December 17, 2007